

CELEBRATING 25 YEARS WITH THE SHORENSTEIN CENTER
EXPLORING: THE MEDIA AND POLITICS FRONTIER

UNEDITED TRANSCRIPT

Friday

October 14, 2011

Nye Conference Center

Taubman Building, Fifth Floor

Harvard Kennedy School

MR. JONES: Steve Grove is sort of the Kennedy School's favorite son in tech land. He was one of them, I should say, one of them. But he's certainly one of ours. When I called to ask Steve to do this he immediately answered his cell phone, which in and of itself is kind of an extraordinary thing for someone to do these days, I think. And he was in the marketplace in Cairo, which is just one of the ways he is living his life these days. Steve is now -- his title is the Director of News and Political Content, Strategy and Programming for YouTube, which is a huge job and a huge mandate and an extraordinary amount of responsibility for someone who is so young.

But he has been already in this position -- had incredible coups such as interviews with the President and debates and so forth. He is going to be interviewing Anne Marie Slaughter. He will introduce her. She is also an old friend of the Shorenstein Center and also one of the people who is really thoughtful about the world it was and the way it's evolving into a very different world. Steve, the floor is yours.

MR. GROVE: All right, thanks, Alex. And thanks for having me. I should say before we began I am a huge fan of the Shorenstein Center. When I was here the Shorenstein Center gave me a grant to start a cable access television show at CCTV

down the road, we call it at softball, sort of the Harvard student version of hardball, I guess. And then when I graduated from the Kennedy School they also gave me a grant to profile Kennedy School students around the world who were doing interesting things. And it was on that trip that I discovered YouTube as we posted clips back to the U.S. of some of our footage and so I really became enamored with the site, so I sort of owe, for sure, a big part of the past five years of my career to the Shorenstein Center. It's really an honor to be back here again today.

And it's a very special honor to be interviewing Anne Marie Slaughter, who many of you may know, but I'll read off a couple of ticks from her bio, just to sort of set the stage before we begin. She has a prestigious career in international affairs and international law. Essentially for the decade after 9/11 she was a Dean of the Woodrow Wilson School down at Princeton. And this was a time when everyone was rethinking foreign policy completely, as was Anne Marie and her team at Princeton. She really sort of rebuilt the school with a new faculty, new staff, several new centers, wrote a new book called -- wrote a book called *The New World Order* and then she went on to work for Secretary Clinton for a couple of years in the government, which is what I would like to talk to you about today to start us off.

Anne Marie, when you were at state there was this new sort of buzz word that started coming out in your two years there called 21st Century statecraft. And I wonder if you could just sort of tell us what you think 21st Century statecraft is.

MS. SLAUGHTER: So, first of all, it's great to be here. It's great to be back. I have not been back often since I left Harvard Law School and the Kennedy School for Princeton, but there are many old friends. And I will say the only thing I would add to my bio is that I'm SlaughterAM on Twitter. I bill myself as a foreign policy curator, as many of you can actually see--

MR. GROVE: It's amazing. You have 16,000 followers on Twitter and you tweet about foreign policy. I mean you are not tweeting about dancing cat videos on YouTube or the latest Justin Bieber. That's really impressive.

MS. SLAUGHTER: No, I try to stick to foreign policy. But one thing I will say as I join this world of everything from digital activism to media to tech, the Shorenstein

Center and the Berkman Center are together, really, the place to be. I hate to say that coming from Princeton, but there is just tremendous resources here. And I often find myself reading and re-sending things that come from here. So I am particularly pleased to be here.

So now that I have dodged your question for a while, 21st Century statecraft. So 21st Century statecraft actually came out of Alec Ross, who is the Secretary's special advisor for innovation, actually had been on the Obama campaign's team for media. And the Secretary Clinton hired him. And policy planning, my shop, out with Jared Cohen who is now the head of Google Ideas. And what it is is a way of using technology to engage as many non-traditional participants as possible in foreign policy. So most people actually think, oh, it's just Twitter diplomacy. It means now our embassies are tweeting what they do. Well, yes, they are. But they were doing that as part of public diplomacy.

What made 21st Century statecraft really important was thinking about all the ways technology can advance our foreign policy goals and thinking about how you use technology to bring NGO's, business, universities and individuals into the foreign policy process. So I'll just give you a couple of examples. We led what we called Tech-Dells to different countries. So we, a technology delegation, high level executives from Google and YouTube and Twitter and various technology companies wen to Iraq, to Russia, to Brazil, to Syria. I led one to Sierra Leone and to Liberia. In each of these we would go to the country, obviously be hosted by the embassy, and then the embassy would organize lots and lots of meetings with the nonprofit sector, the private sector, all focused on how you could use technology to work on whatever problems they were working on.

In my case in Sierra Leone and Liberia we looked at how you use technology to reduce maternal mortality. But we also connected them with Google people and Twitter people and other people that they could then continue to consult in various ways. So that's one example of how it isn't just about using the tools, it's thinking about how the tools transform what you can do to solve foreign policy problems.

MR. GROVE: So why private companies? Why would you bring a private company on an international diplomatic trip or a tech company?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Well, tech companies because that's where, as we have been hearing this morning, as Joe Nye said, that's where the infrastructure is, that's where the energy is, that's where the innovation is. And we wanted to engage those folks as much as possible. Sometimes you had -- a lot of it was public/private partnerships. So in the Haiti earthquake, for instance, we combined Ushahidi, which is the software that was -- it means witness in Swahili. It's the software that was developed in Kenya for people to be able to report on the elections from wherever they were.

We took that, we applied it in Haiti so that people could tweet -- not tweet, but send in where they needed help, but we used a private company to help fund it. So I actually think that is the model for foreign policy going forward. Increasingly it will be public/private partnerships. It's interesting, at the Washington Ideas Forum a week ago just about every government official who was up there started talking about public/private partnerships. Part of that is because governments' resources are reduced. So you have to reach out. But part of it is there is just so much capacity to mobilize in the private sector and the civic sector that it would be crazy not to bring them in.

MR. GROVE: It has been an incredible, incredible year for technology in politics. It's funny, a lot of the things that we've seen within the tech community over the past six months have kind of verified and amplified the trends of the past four or five years. But now I think sort of everyone has woken up to this. But I want to take a look back at the Arab Spring for a moment and the role that citizen media played, the role that personal technology played. Some say it documented what took place, some say it inspired people, some said it organized people. A lot of conjecture about what the influence of these tools were for people.

When you look back at this and look forward at citizen media in foreign policy, what do you think is the actual net worth of citizens being engaged in this

way? What is the most important role that personal technology is playing as citizens now are on the stage of being involved in foreign policy more directly?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Well, so I am not going to claim direct knowledge. I'm going to quote an Egyptian blogger who appeared at the Personal Democracy Forum in June who is very engaged in the April 6th movement. And the way he described it was that technology allowed them to stay one step ahead of the government. That prior to having Facebook and Twitter, they had had to take over an entire institution, a whole factory, a whole university, because they had to mobilize everybody. And by the time they did that the government had caught up with them.

And what he said was this allowed them to take every group with a complaint you could imagine, from soccer clubs to factory workers to students, much smaller groups, link them all up and stay one step ahead of the government. So it is not the cause of these revolutions. And we know that. To call them Twitter revolutions, when people are standing in front of bullets is really to denigrate the courage and the determination of people who have decided that they have had enough.

That said, it's not just amplification. I mean the folks who want to say nothing new under the sun say, ah, this is just amplification of their message. Not so. It allows them to -- it's like asymmetric warfare. It allows them to even up the playing field, them versus the government, and to stay one step ahead. Now, the governments of course are catching up as fast as they can and I think of that as kind of the technology of liberation versus the technology of oppression. It's the same technology.

MR. GROVE: Yeah, I mean, you look at, for example, the Iranian Government has used YouTube videos to target specific dissidents and go after them. The Chinese Government has tracked web activity to find who is organizing and where. Are you worried about that? Do you think that the -- in which direction is the balance tilting right now, because certainly governments are catching up to using these tools just as savvily as citizens are.

MS. SLAUGHTER: Well, I should quote Vivek Kundra this morning, having been in government, I'm pretty confident that the kids will stay one step ahead. I really am. I mean, in terms of the innovation and the constant ferment and adaptation which is what you need, the Chinese Government, the Syrian Government, they are -- it is a real problem. I mean, obviously, they can document, they can spread misinformation. I don't mean to make light of it. And when these activists are captured the first thing people want is their cell phone and then they can go on to their Twitter account or their Facebook account, but I really do put my money on the kids.

MR. GROVE: When you look at what's happening on Wall Street right now, do you see similarities with what is happening in other parts of the world this year?

MS. SLAUGHTER: I do. Again, the first thing I would say is the difference between facing tanks and guns and camping out on a square in Wall Street, I mean, even if the New York Police are not doing what they should is radically different. So to say this is our Arab Spring, I think diminishes again the courage of what we see in the Middle East. That said, I think there are similar drivers and I think the organizational structure is definitely similar. The drivers I do think are what I've written, I call it invisibility and injustice. The injustice is simply the gross inequality in the sense that, you know, people who are on the edge of financial and social ruin are sitting there next to people whose bonuses are going up. And you see that. It's widespread. It's actually part of what drives the Tea Party, but it's definitely there.

But the other piece, and this I think is similar in the Middle East, has been this sense of invisibility. That the political system is not responding, so they are going to actually take this into their own hands. The other thing that is similar is this radical decentralization and this refusal to want leaders. There are similarities again in Egypt where the media kept trying to go to various people and say, so, you're the leader, you're the leader. And he would say, no, no, no, I'm not the leader. I don't want there to be a leader. And a part of that is they didn't want to be arrested. But part of that a philosophy of radical decentralization, local mobilization and general

democracy. They will discover pretty quickly that full democracy means nothing ever gets done. But it is a stage that they go through.

MR. GROVE: I wonder if -- we live in a world now where information moves very fastly. Citizens do have the power of, you know, the NBC news studio in their pocket with their cell phone camera. They can organize in new ways. Do you ever wonder if citizens actually have an inflated sense of their ability to exercise power because they have less patience today or more power through technology? Do you think there is a gap in sort of, oh, I have the same power as NBC News because I have a cell phone in my pocket, but they might not actually have that. Because we see some of these things succeed and some of them don't.

MS. SLAUGHTER: That's interesting. I hadn't thought about people thinking they have too much power.

MR. GROVE: Well, not too much power but actually thinking they have more power than they do because some of these technologies give them new opportunities.

MS. SLAUGHTER: Well, what I do see is a certain amount of, you know, if you capture it and upload it or tweet it you've done something. So there is the danger of substituting the witnessing for the actual mobilization and action. Because we still need actual action. But I have to say in many of the ways that we heard about this morning, I mean, for instance people being able to witness corruption or witness human rights violations and send that out, individually, that's not that powerful. But if you put in aggregators and, again, we need a whole new vocabulary for an entirely new set of professional roles. I mean curators, aggregators, connectors. So the aggregators that put all those little pieces of data together, that has power. And then you also need the experts. You need the people with legitimacy in political circles to say, hey, look at this and you have to actually then mobilize action.

MR. GROVE: How do you get your news every day?

MS. SLAUGHTER: I get it through Twitter. Twitter has revolutionized the way I understand the world and connect. So I want to say something now. Marvin, you were talking about translating. For many of you there are two conferences going on

right now. There is the conference that is happening right now, we are sitting here and we're talking and you are listening to us. Many of us are actually tweeting what we're seeing and you can see that up on the screen as we go. If this were a younger conference, I'm sorry but that's the way it is, you would actually see many more people talking to each other as they tweet. So they would be listening to us. They would be tweeting. Somebody else would be responding. Other people would be watching that on the screen as it was going on and it would be multiple conferences.

At the same time, I checked this morning as I was tweeting, my tweets were getting re-tweeted by somebody in Beijing, by somebody in Indonesia and by somebody in Spain. And all of those had a thousand plus followers. And you will see, it will get re-tweeted all day long. So it's hard to describe that for me Twitter has meant that I am now connected to all sorts of people. There people in this room I have never met but I feel like I know because I met them through Twitter.

And when I go to conferences, I was just in Lagos, and I met a *New York Times* columnist I had met through Twitter. It has opened my life. I get much better news. I still read *The Times*, I just read it on Twitter. I just read the stories that I know people are sending. But it means that I don't just think *The New York Times* is gospel anymore.

MR. GROVE: So Twitter for you is--

MS. SLAUGHTER: And YouTube.

MR. GROVE: YouTube is sort of the content that gets pushed out--

MS. SLAUGHTER: Right. I mean, most of these tweets are linking. That's the other thing. These are not 140 character messages. These are links to YouTube videos of Syrian protesters getting clubbed or Libyans or what is going on on the ground or blogs or newspaper commentary.

MR. GROVE: One of the things we've done at YouTube to try to -- because for me Twitter is sort of this fire hose information. It takes a long time to filter out, these are my Syrian Twitter followers people are using. So there is a lot of effort that has to take place in order to do that. So at YouTube what we're doing is this firm called Storyful that actually does this sort of social search algorithms and then sort

of compiles all that stuff into feeds for you so you can consume that more consistently. So we have -- we're getting more and more effective raw streams of footage. But I wonder if when you think about just the media right now, so we have an increase in information from citizens from around the world, but as we all know in this room a decrease in the number of foreign bureaus, even I think I read a recent study that said something like 50 percent less foreign news is now in American newspapers than it was five years ago or something. So are you worried there is a gap between, okay, we're getting a lot more information from different sources around the world, but in fact American journalistic institutions aren't able to go out and cover it in the same way as they once were?

MS. SLAUGHTER: I'm not. I'm not worried because as we heard this morning I think journalism is getting dis-aggregated and put back together differently. So if you think it used to be one person who got out there, who discovered as much data as he or she could who then wrote it up, then it got edited and out it went. Now you've got the data gatherers who are the people who are reporting on what they see. So we have infinitely more information actually from the field. Then you have aggregators. Then you still have people who are writing, whether they are bloggers or journalists on site. So I now follow foreign newspapers.

I might have once followed the foreign bureau of *The New York Times*. Now I'm following the local newspaper and getting information directly there. And then you have the curators who are bringing it together. So the functions that a newspaper performed are all getting performed but they are getting broken out and done by many different people. Now how we put that all together in market models that make sense, that's part of the questions of today, but there are. There are boutique sites. I think also if you look at The Daily Beast or Huff Post they are bigger sites that you can go to. I think it means many, many, many more people can participate in the enterprise. You don't have to get blessed by one of the top newspapers.

MR. GROVE: If your next job was, to take sort of Ken's question for Vivek earlier, not to run the *Boston Globe*, but let's say to run the foreign section, the

foreign affairs section of a newspaper today and let's say you had at least a little bit of money to get going, how would you begin to put together these pieces, curators, aggregators, correspondents, what are the sort of key variables you would put together as an institution create a great foreign affairs page?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Well, my answer is going to quickly disabuse anybody of ever wanting to put me in this position.

(Laughter)

MS. SLAUGHTER: But what I would do, I have actually given some thought to this just because you have so much information available on YouTube and Twitter and Facebook. But the first thing I would do is get what I think of as scourers, it's a hard word to say, but people who would scour Twitter feed and YouTube and the internet. It's not that hard to do because there are hash tags and there's lots of categorizing going on, but people who really are good at looking at whole mass of data and pulling it together. So that's the first thing I would get are people who are mapping what is out there and bringing it in. Then you would get curators who figure out very quickly what is efficient.

The reason I say I'm a foreign policy curator on Twitter is because I've spent 25 years studying this stuff. I don't try to follow it systematically, but I can look at 200 tweets and tell you pretty much instantly which ten are interesting. I mean, any of us can in our area. That's my expertise. So you can get curators who will be able to look very fast and say, yeah, this is relevant. This is not. This is news. This is not. This is credible. This is not. Then from there you get people who can turn it out that way so you have a website that you can actually go, you know, you have a Twitter feed.

And Vivek said this again, you still really need the experts and the people who can offer you insight. Those people if anything are more important than ever because there is so much information. So again I would have many of the people who are there now, but I would have them doing it across a much wider base and in a more dis-aggregated way.

MR. GROVE: I want to ask you a little bit about the intersection of government and media. A little bit later today we get to hear from the Washington Bureau Chief of Al Jazeera. I want to give you a quote that I read of his recently that I find really interesting. He goes there has been criticism that Al Jazeera is funded by the government. He said to be honest I don't know what objective journalism means. If you're an American network broadcasting from the U.S. you would be broadcasting with a sensibility that may not look necessarily objective to an audience in another part of the world. And the same is true if you are a network like Al Jazeera broadcasting out of the Middle East. Do you agree with that?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Well, I certainly think there are degrees of objectivity. So when I read *The New York Times* and often after I've been on Twitter for a while *The New York Times* is a kind of haven, you get back to really curated well edited journalism as opposed to, you know, once I was engaged in the Libya stuff everybody sent me stuff from Libya. Most of it was advocacy. It took me very little time to figure out that I did not want to re-tweet this stuff because it was not verified. So I think there is more objective journalism and less. I actually think Al Jazeera is pretty good. But it certainly has its biases. *The New York Times* has its biases, *The Post*, the *Globe*, they all have their biases.

What I think we are seeing and here again I'll build on what Vivek said is we're more able to get at what we think of as the truth and there is no one thing that is the truth, but there are things that are more the truth than others, through really what is a globalization of the adversary system. I'm a law professor originally. American legal system is based on the idea that as many people pounding at pieces of information is the way you get at the truth. That's not the European system. The European system is one person investigating. But we believe, as a country, in the adversary system when we're thinking about the kind of truth that is responsible for putting someone in jail or not.

And one way of thinking about what we heard this morning is exactly that, as you just heard in the last panel. You say something wrong and, boy, do you know it very quickly. It gets corrected instantly. So I actually do think that with lots of

different players and again, when I go on Al Jazeera or I go on *The Times* or *The Economist* or many of the people I still follow, I know that's more objective than what *Citizen Journal* is, but even there it is good to read other newspapers that will contradict what Al Jazeera says, but also Al Jazeera to contradict what other newspapers say.

MR. GROVE: I wonder if you've thought about the role that like state run media plays in all this. One of the top viewed YouTube channels in the news section of YouTube is From Russia Today. They are phenomenal at pushing information out on the web and around the world. CCTV and the Xinhua News outlet in China are credited possibly the same. The U.S. used to do this more with VOA and Radio Free Europe, but not so much anymore. Is the U.S. behind in this regard? Is that the wrong approach? What's your sense on that?

MS. SLAUGHTER: No, I don't, I mean, it is interesting to watch how governments are doing this. It reminds me of living in China and reading the *China Daily* every day. You know it was radically biased but there was nothing else in English to read, so you read it and tried to sort of sort out. But for the U.S., we are -- we don't need an official voice. There are so many American journalists on these social media platforms who are providing information. One thing we are doing, some of our best embassies are doing is becoming aggregators or good information that is often critical of surrounding governments. So the U.S. Embassy Pretoria, which is Don Gips is our ambassador and he is very familiar with technology, they get online every morning and they cull news from across Africa and it's great stuff.

So instead of it being here is what the United States of America thinks, it will pull something from a Kenyan pundit. It will pull something from a newspaper in another capitol. And if you follow it you actually, what you're seeing is the United States as a platform for lots of different information, good information, often contending and critical information, which I think is a far better way to pitch ourselves.

MR. GROVE: It's like the BBC in some ways, a little bit of government--

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yeah, absolutely.

MR. GROVE: --but a symbol of journalism versus something else. When you were in office, when you did this Quadrennial Review, which essentially looked at all the State Department and said what can we do better, one of the other things you talked about was sending out these sort of regional media hubs. I'm probably going to get this wrong in the specifics, but the general idea was sending out media hubs where communities could come together and practice journalism, learn about it. Has that happened and can you tell us a bit more about that as a strategy for public diplomacy?

MS. SLAUGHTER: So there are a couple of media hubs, but we've got a long way to go. And one of the things Secretary Clinton did immediately and Judith McHale, the Undersecretary for Public Affairs, was to say we have to respond to everything. I mean we had situations where terrible things were being said about the United States and nobody would respond for days. So there were war rooms created in embassies. Now, one of the things you have to do if you are going to respond is you have to loosen up the controls on the diplomats who are going to respond. I mean, it's often the middle of night in Washington, so if they want to say something and they have to go back to Washington, well, it's going to be 24 hours. On the other hand they might say something that isn't vetted. So there has to be -- you have to tell them that they can respond, but deeper than that you have to allow more risk in the culture, in the diplomatic culture for understandable reasons is rather risk averse. So there was a lot there.

The regional idea was also that you could partly just consolidate different things, but also that you could bring people together from a region and then have a regional strategy for news. Some of it is working. I actually think though the idea of different embassies in different ways becoming platforms for news is probably a better way to go.

MR. GROVE: You wrote a book three or four years ago about American values and I think you actually went on the Colbert Report and talked about it. I remember seeing that clip at some point.

MS. SLAUGHTER: I did. It's the only thing my kids think is remotely cool, that I was on Colbert.

MR. GROVE: Well, I remember you were talking about American values and how the world sees us. And I wonder, A, does the world care as much now about American values and, B, like is there -- what is the best way to demonstrate American values through media. Is there something that we could be doing better as a country, as a government, as journalists even to speak with the rest of the world about what it means to be an American?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Well, the first thing I would say is actually if you look at the national security strategy of the Obama Administration, it uses the formulation that America's national interest is respect. It is in America's national interest for there to be respect for universal values. And I think that's the way to put it. These are universal values. We have a version of them. In this room our version of freedom of speech is more extreme than anybody else's version of freedom of speech. But freedom of speech is a universal value. We have the way we interpret it. Many other countries have different ways. And that's the way I think about it.

But I think the best, by far, the best way to live our values is in fact to be openly self-critical and to embrace that constant process of contestation and of we're not living up to our own standards. We're supposed to. That process is what I think is best about us. It's exactly that we say we're for liberty and justice and equality, well, how come our income distribution has gotten so terrible skewed. If we say we're for equality, how can that be? And for the world to see that process. Because we don't have any special superior characteristics as people. We do have a system that allows a constant process of critique and improvement. And that to me is what we ought to be showing. And a lot of this media is exactly about that.

MR. GROVE: I want to turn this to questions, so please head to the mic if you have one. And my last question would be returning to the 21st Century statecraft we began our conversation on, moving forward, as you look in the future of where 21st Century statecraft is headed, what can the State Department, what's the most important thing the State Department can do to effectively practice it?

MS. SLAUGHTER: My own view is that we can be the place that knows all the best ways that you can use personal mobile devices to empower individuals, whether those are expectant mothers who can get weekly texts to tell them what they should expect while they are expecting. Every American woman who has had a child knows that book. In Russia we launched an app that now tells every Russian woman, if she's got that app, what to expect. But also allows them to send in health information, which in turn allows them to get to a clinic well before crisis. Or we ought to know far more about what's working in technology that combats corruption. So I paid a bribe. Every time you pay a bribe you text it and then you can map that. I could give you ten other examples. I think 21st Century statecraft is about bringing as many non-traditional participants into the enterprise and using technology to solve problems. The best thing we could do is to really be expert in how individuals who have this technology more and more can empower themselves.

FROM THE FLOOR: Coming back to the revolution, do you really believe that it was YouTube videos who got the people on the street or was it not people like Nik Gowing taking one or two of the videos on BBC, on Al Jazeera, and that made the people going in the streets and fighting for their rights? And the second question is you put so much effort into social media and engaging the people in that region, how come the distrust into the American government is growing by the years and not going down after all these efforts?

MR. GROVE: Do you want me to answer the YouTube?

MS. SLAUGHTER: You answer the YouTube question.

MR. GROVE: I think you are absolutely right that the videos, the key videos being curated and put on television is a tremendous end of that process. I mean, the way we look at it is you have this massive amount of content on a platform, 48 hours of video uploaded every minute, three billion videos viewed every day I think is the latest stat. The first thing is just finding it. So we use both, curation with the group Storyful I was telling you about, but also some algorithmic things define that stuff. Then we try to hub it together on this channel we have called CitizenTube. But then the most important thing we do, we then push it to the media. So we drive all

broadcast media to this channel. They take a look, they put it in context, they work it into their stories.

And that to us is the critical final step is what ends up on CNN or what ends up on the BBC or who ever else has been looked at by someone who practices journalism. We at YouTube don't do that. We don't scale that way. That's not how we -- that's the value that we add. So I see in some ways our responsibility is discovery and curation and then the journalist's responsibility is to provide content.

MS. SLAUGHTER: In the first place we put so much energy into this. I was only in government for two years and much of what I'm talking about is barely a year old. So I would not for a minute expect it to increase trust in the U.S. Government and actually, if you take my model that says a lot of what people ought to see as American citizens challenging their government, I don't necessarily expect them to trust our government. I do expect them to see that our government lives its values of accepting citizens challenging it in every way. And that to me is an important message to say. But overall the reasons, we know the reasons that we have dismal rates of approval across the Arab world. It has much more to do with Iraq than it does any kind of social media. I do think one of the big reasons that I supported intervention in Libya was the sense that we now have a new generation coming of age across the Middle East.

We now have to actually try to live our values as much as we can and we're still not in all sorts of ways, necessary foreign policy trade offs, but where we can they need to see that we are willing to go in there and actually support the people in the streets. And that over time that can improve our relationship with lots and lots of people but I don't expect them to love us anytime soon.

FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you. Thanks for the great conversation. One of the -

MS. SLAUGHTER: You are?

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm Bill Powers, former Shorenstein Fellow. One of the leaders of the Egyptian revolution was an employee of Google, which struck me as a metaphor for how influential our technology companies have become in the world,

just separate from our government. Is there a way in which American technological power is converging with American political and diplomatic power in the world and is that a good thing, a bad thing, or neutral?

MS. SLAUGHTER: I would frame it a little differently. I would say that being the source of this technology is very, very good for us in the world at a time when we are losing credibility politically and financially. If you look at the Four Horsemen, you know, Facebook and Twitter and YouTube and Amazon, you are -- those are still coming out of us. There is all sorts of exciting stuff going on elsewhere, but fundamentally I think most people who are using these media are seeing the United States in that light. And that's just a very good thing. And to the extent that technology again could help empower people, that's also a way that they ought to see us. But I don't think we should try to do it more deliberately.

And actually I said we led these tech delegations, we obviously didn't just take Google folks. We took as many people as we could and similarly USAID has done a lot with the Gates Foundation and with Microsoft because that's where the head of it came from. He's very careful to make sure that we're not identifying the government with any one technology company.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi, I'm Martin Nisenholtz from the New York Times Company. Thanks, by the way, for your kind words about *The Times*. There is a bit of an undertone in some of these conversations about an either/or. It's either traditional media or -- and I just wanted everyone to know that we are deeply integrating Twitter, Facebook, Google into our experiences. A good example, when we covered the hurricane coming up the coast at the end of August, a lot of the stuff that was being reported was being reported through Twitter on our pages, curated by our folks.

So the model that you have laid out, I don't think is that far away, actually happening in traditional news organizations. And you know, it's already happening in my respects at *The Times*. Facebook is now powering all of our identity management systems. So we see these deep relationships as very, very important to

us and as being kind of paving the way for the future. So I just wanted you to know that.

MS. SLAUGHTER: So I would just say a lot of *The Times* reporters have been fabulous on Twitter. And C.J. Chivers or Chivers, I don't actually know how -- I've just seen it written. But *The Times* Libya correspondent, you could tweet him when he was on the ground in Libya and he'd be responding. It was really extraordinary. And then you would read his pieces as soon as he posted them and then you would see them in the paper. I still get a paper. I don't always read it but it's still there. So I think that's absolutely right. And Nick Kristof has a million followers. When Nick Kristof tweets something, it's very powerful.

The only thing I would say and I think that's right, but my vision might not be profitable, but the day *The Times* advertises for curators, that actually there are categories of people who can amplify the way you do that in more non-traditional roles. So I think there is a tremendous mix, but there is another couple--

FROM THE FLOOR: I absolutely agree. One must be patient. But I don't think that's an impossibility. I would just suggest and our ex-public editor is here, he may want to make a comment at some point, that in looking for curators it's a little bit more difficult than it may seem just on the surface, only because so many people who aren't subject to the -- I don't want to say values, because they are subject to the values, but to the rules in fact of the journalistic community may have conflicts of interest that are hidden. So you can go to a physician for example who is a deep expert on kidney disease, but he hasn't really told anyone that he's also a consultant with Pfizer, so now you're asking him to be a so called curator in an area where he has a clear conflict of interest.

Now clearly there are identity management processes that can clean that up over time. But we really do have to be careful about conflict when we go into that world. So just as a heads up.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm Beth Noble. I was a doctoral student here and now I'm a professor at Fordham. I spent 14 years as a correspondent based in Moscow, so I have to pick up on what you said about Russia today. This is a highly biased

news channel funded by the Russian Government. So their view of events in Russia is pretty different than the view of events I reported, say, when I was at CBS. So the question is how do we teach people to be educated consumers of news and information in a world where the information sphere is so big it just can't be curated?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Well, I don't know how we teach it. As a mother I think I see it happening in the sense that I really did grow up believing the printed word, particularly if it was in a book or of an official newspaper, then it was true. But my kids don't think that at all because they constantly get conflicting information and, indeed, we often look up conflicting information. We don't look at the Encyclopedia Britannica, we Google something and lots of different things come up. So I think that's happening here. I take your point in a place like Russia where people are less digitally connected or even if they are they are less used to multiple sources of information. That's much tougher. But for in the sense of people here consuming that news, you would get Russia Today but you would also get Russian bloggers and you would get other sources. So I just think that the respect for the fact that something is written or is put out there is much less.

MR. GROVE: The web has created a new culture around -- a culture of scrutiny but also this culture of understanding that information simply just comes from different places. And there is not a -- the high priest voice necessarily isn't something that younger folks today in encountering news for the first time necessarily take in. Over here.

FROM THE FLOOR: Nik Gowing. I was a Fellow here back in 1994. What I'm going to share with you is the work that I have been doing since then, which continues very much the spirit of what I did way back then when it was about the CNN effect. I'm a main presenter for the BBC now. I was at ITN then. First of all a comment, Anne Marie, as with *The New York Times*, we are embracing this incredibly. And when our German colleague I think said what does Nik Gowing do about Syria, we go through an extraordinary process of validation even if it comes from YouTube. And there have been times during Lybia and also Syria where we

have been fed information which you wouldn't know about, but we have seen video which we know came from a few months or a couple of years ago. So we have to be incredibly careful. This authentication process is about brand and reputation and many of you like the BBC, that's one of the reasons. But we do have the staffing to do that, even though I have to tell you in this room that we are about to go through a 20 percent reduction in our cost space because of what's happened with the government. That's another issue.

What I want to share with you is the work I have been doing in the last three or four years which is very much in parallel to what Joe has been doing, Joe Nye has been doing about which summarizes this, that because of this a new environment, there is a new vulnerability, fragility and brittleness of power, whether you are in government or a civil servant or you're a corporate. Secondly, that is forcing a new level of accountability at a pace which is simply unmanageable, whether you are in a boardroom or you're in the cabinet.

And thirdly, that's leading to ultimately a deficit of legitimacy. Because the public, particularly the next generation who are consuming this stuff and seeing it on their Smart Phone are saying I can see it on my Smart Phone, I can see the video, maybe from YouTube, but I'm not hearing anything from the government or from the corporate. What I would therefore like to ask you, Anne Marie, is particularly after what you talked about Judith McHale and what Alex Ross and you and I have talked privately about this in the past, to which I pay tribute actually. I would say it's very much a rare mountain of movement, which I see in companies and in government. Most are still suffering from a significant mind set of denial. That this is in any way undermining their power and their ability to either govern or be a responsible corporate leader.

I wonder what your reflection is about the scale of acceptance of this dramatic new reality which, as you say, has really only been happening in the last year and obviously I could be accused of capitalizing on what has happened in the last few months with the Arab awakening, with the British Airports Authority, with BP where 22 percent of the social media in the United States was consumed by one

issue only. It was only BP. The chief executive didn't realize it. So we're talking about a culture of denial here and that's what I see time and time again, including in a speech in London I gave only yesterday morning, that ultimately on 3 to 5 percent of executives and those in government, whether in India or Singapore, who was shaken as we discovered Vivek was on the same platform I think, we've discovered that the former foreign minister was completely shaken by what happened in the election earlier this year, that the PAP only got 62 percent of the vote. They didn't expect it and the impact of social media. Same in India at the moment with Anna Hazare, a 74 year old social activist who sat on -- making the complaint about corruption and didn't just get several hundred, he got several million mobilized digitally. It's creating an economic business and ultimately a political earthquake in India from one man sitting on his prayer mat using digital power. So I come back to the core of the question saying that this is well beyond the United States. You are seeing it time and time again, including in China and what happened China and what happened in Dalia in mid-August.

MS. SLAUGHTER: So first of all, thanks. And I would recommend to everybody here, because if you're here you will be interested in it, Nik's book, which is *Sky Full of Lies and Black Swans* which really documents a lot of this. It's a wonderful book. So first place, I think you're right. BBC calling. You know it's going to be yours. First of all, I think you're completely right that there is a tremendous amount of denial and what I witnessed was sort of interesting, because Secretary Clinton obviously ran a much less tech savvy campaign than President Obama. She learned from that very quickly and she hired one of the guys who had advised President Obama to do this stuff at the State Department. So she, herself, she uses a little, but she understood that she had to have people around her who really did get this. So she was at least open to it that way.

But what I see, I see two things. One is just sheer fear. If I talk to my parents about this stuff my mother says how do you do this? I mean, I'm swamped with information already. How could I possibly take in anymore, to which the response is you just kind of jump in the stream and you respond but you don't try to control.

And that goes to the second point. Governments are still operating not on a measure or observe and react model, they are operating on a control and plan model. And that just doesn't work. It doesn't work in industry. The best industry sees what is out there and responds very quickly. But government, you know, we spent our time, I was head of policy planning doing plans for next year and five years and ten years out. I don't know if there is a solution beyond generational change. But I definitely see what you see.

FROM THE FLOOR: But the word denial. In other words it will go away, because *Sky Full of Lies* comes from the Burmese Government.

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yes, it does.

FROM THE FLOOR: Which said what is happening on the streets and being transmitted around the world isn't really happening, it's a sky full of lies. And I see that still time and time again.

MS. SLAUGHTER: So there less so perhaps though with the British and the American Governments. I mean, as people in democracies, as they get elected in part using these tools they are not going to deny them in the same way. Although I don't think they fully understand the dynamics of how it challenges the business of governments with respect to Burma or China or others, yeah, I do think there's denial.

MR. GROVE: Marvin.

MR. KALB: Anne Marie, I ask this question basically to give myself another opportunity to understand what you were getting at. And listening to Nik and to yourself earlier, I am more and more impressed by the necessity to have greater confidence in the accuracy of the information that you are being given. Because you spoke here in the roughest translation, but at one point you seemed to be saying that whether you are reading *The New York Times* or watching Al Jazeera or picking stuff up on your tweet machine, that it all at a certain point equalizes. You said asymmetrical at one point, that you give people the power of the government. Everything becomes equal.

But to what extent is that real? To what extent is the information that we are increasingly dependent upon? Accurate, reliable, real, the fundamentals of good journalism. And my concern is that for those of you who are light years ahead of me in understanding all of this, that the technology is so far ahead of basic value systems of journalism that you seem to be more absorbed with the end result of the new technology than you are with enhancing some of the fundamental values of a free press. So help me through that kind of dilemma.

MS. SLAUGHTER: So, Marvin, I think I'm saying exactly the opposite. I really do. So let me sort out a couple of different things. One, the asymmetry point is not about journalism. It's about social protesters staying ahead of a government. So it's not about getting news, per se, it's about people who are trying to organize opposition and who can use social media and the dis-aggregation, the decentralization it allows to stay one step ahead of a very centralized, oppressive, brutal government. That's the asymmetry. In news though I don't think -- I'm saying something very different. I'm saying once I read *The New York Times* and thought that is the truth, until they started covering me occasionally and then I didn't think that was the truth.

And I still think *The New York Times*, the BBC, *The Economist*, Al Jazeera, it's very clear when you are reading something that is done by a professional journalist and I now get far more from professional journalists than I ever did before because I follow them individually and I don't have to wait for the newspaper to come. But I now get information that can contradict what *The New York Times* says and some of it comes from people who are on the ground and some of that comes from people who I know are credible. And I should have said this before, the question from the professor from Fordham, any of you -- there's a guy named Andy Carvin who is an NPR Senior Strategist, so Andy Carvin set himself up as the curator of what was coming out of the Middle East.

So he's a journalist. He's from NPR. He made it his business to verify the credibility of what was coming out. So very soon I would not retweet anything unless it had come from him, because I knew he had the people on the ground and

he was checking and he was getting videos and tweets on everything under the sun. But what he produced was often either ahead of what I was getting out of *The Times* or *The Post* or somewhere else, or contradictory and that's where I said I come out of law where I think if I see multiple sources I'm actually in a better position to try to figure out what is truth, still relying on the profession of journalism but understanding that there is no one canonical source. So I actually think I'm getting better information and closer to some thing that I still believe in as truth.

MR GROVE: We have time for one more question.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi, Alexis Gelber, former Fellow, a long time editor at *Newsweek* and now teaching at NYU. This has been a fascinating discussion and I just want to follow up by asking how all of this affects the more traditional aspects of diplomacy for our government. How does -- what happens when governments crack down on journalists, either citizen or otherwise, for upholding the American values of freedom of speech, or increasingly try to crack down on American tech companies that are providing the platforms for this sort of dissent. How does the government face that as a diplomatic challenge?

MS. SLAUGHTER: So, it's a great question. And the first thing is that, I mean, that was the impetus behind Secretary Clinton's original internet freedom speech and then the second. So she gave two and this was again something that Alex Ross's office and mine were very actively involved in. But the first thing to do was to declare that as our policy, the right to connect, the freedom to connect is as important as other human rights and freedoms. And the speech was actually cast sort of in the mold of Roosevelt's Four Freedoms to indicate this is a fundamental freedom. And when governments crack down then we will respond. And once you put that in policy, then of course all the embassies do have to respond. The other thing I would say is we're able to get information very quickly about when outages have occurred.

In other words, so you again using the very social media and again in a lot of the Arab Spring you would get information that something had gone down and that would allow us to respond more quickly. Beyond that though you are back to the

continual tension of having to have relations with a country and having to point out that you object to what it's doing, which is still there. I do believe in the Obama Administration's philosophy of engagement, that we ought to be talking to all these governments and so we protest it, but when Google left China obviously we still were working with China. We did what we could to help in various ways but you can't privilege any one company. But beyond that we can't -- we're not doing anything more than we do with traditional human rights violations.

MR. JONES: Thank you all.

(Applause)

MR. GROVE: If you haven't seen it yet, by the way, Anne Marie started a new blog at *The Atlantic*, what, maybe two months ago?

MS. SLAUGHTER: Yeah.

MR. GROVE: Called the Foreign Policy Frontier. I definitely recommend you check it out to hear more from her.

MR. JONES: Great. Thank you all. That was terrific. We've had a great morning, I think.